



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/773,191	02/09/2004	Kia Silverbrook	MTB21US	8430
24011	7590	02/21/2006	EXAMINER	
SILVERBROOK RESEARCH PTY LTD 393 DARLING STREET BALMAIN, NSW 2041 AUSTRALIA				CHOI, HAN S
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2853		

DATE MAILED: 02/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/773,191	SILVERBROOK, KIA
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Han S. Choi	2853

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 09 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/16/04</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means," "said," and "comprises" should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract contains the word "comprises" in line 1. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Art Unit: 2853

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-54 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 5-19, 24-38, and 42-54 of copending Application No. 10/728779 in view of Thiel (US Pat. 5,714,078).

Silverbrook in copending Application No. 10/728779 discloses the elements of the claimed invention except for a plurality of structures laminated together, the remaining structures including a plurality of passages for the ejectable liquid, the passages extending from the ejectable liquid inlets on the printhead to openings configured for connection to an ejectable liquid supply, adjacent structures within the laminated structure are laminated together so that the passages funnel the ejectable liquid to the ejectable liquid inlet of the printhead, and structures being planar with openings to passages on opposing sides, the openings on one side of the structure being elongated such that the long dimension of the elongated openings on one side is angled relative to the long dimension of the openings of the abutting side. Silverbrook in copending Application No. 10/728779 further does not teach openings in at least one side of one of the structures as a series of channels, and the printhead being formed by lithographically masked etching techniques.

Thiel teaches a plurality of structures laminated together in [Col. 5, Lines 32-40].

Thiel teaches a plurality of ejectable liquid inlets in fluid connection with the nozzles in

Art Unit: 2853

[Col. 4, Lines 48-55]. Thiel teaches a plurality of passages for the ejectable liquid, the passages extending from the ejectable liquid inlets on the printhead to openings configured for connection an ejectable liquid supply in [Col. 3, Lines 32-41]. Thiel teaches adjacent structures within the laminated structure are laminated together so that the passages funnel the ejectable liquid to the ejectable liquid inlets of the printhead in [Col. 20, Lines 53-67] and [Col. 3, Lines 32-41]. Thiel teaches each of the structures, apart from the printhead, are generally planar with openings to the passages on opposing sides, wherein the openings [9 and 14] in the side of one of the structures [3] are elongate, and the openings [102] on the abutting side of the adjacent structure [4] are also elongate; such that, the long dimension of the elongate openings in one side is angled relative to the long dimension of the openings of the abutting side in [Col. 13, Lines 34-38], also shown in Fig. 3. Thiel teaches openings in at least one side of one of the structures [4] is a series of channels [102] in [Col. 11, Lines 42-64] shown in Fig. 3. Thiel teaches the printhead formed using lithographically masked etching techniques in [Col. 18, Lines 42-45].

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to use the structures taught by Thiel with the printhead of Silverbrook in the copending application for the purpose of providing a higher nozzle density per row and a manufacturing process for the printhead with low production costs.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: Line 3 contains “openings is the” and should be changed to “openings on the” to be understandable. Likewise, “elongate” should be changed to “elongated.” Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 1-4, 7, 9, 11, 18-23, 27, 28, 30, 37-41, 45, 47, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubby (US Pat. 5,706,041) in view of Thiel (US Pat. 5,714,078) and Silverbrook (US Pat. 5,856,836).

Kubby discloses the basic elements of the claimed invention referring to claims 1-4, 9, 19-22, 28, 38-41, and 45. Kubby teaches a plurality of nozzles on a printhead in [Col. 1, Lines 5-10]. A heater corresponding to each of the nozzles respectively, the heater having at least one heater element configured for thermal contact with a bubble forming liquid in [Col. 2, Lines 24-33]. Kubby does not teach a plurality of structures laminated together including a printhead, passages for ejectable liquid, the passages extending from the ejectable liquid inlets on the printhead to openings configured for connection to an ejectable liquid supply, and the passages funnel the ejectable liquid to

Art Unit: 2853

the ejectable liquid inlets of the printhead. Kubby does not teach heating the heater element above the boiling point of the bubble forming liquid to form a gas bubble to cause ejection of an ejectable liquid from the nozzle. Kubby does not teach the structures, apart from the printhead, are generally planar with openings to the passages on opposing sides, wherein the openings in the side of one of the structures are elongated, and the openings on the abutting side of the adjacent structure are also elongated; such that, the long dimension of the elongated openings in one side is angled relative to the long dimension of the openings of the abutting side. Kubby does not teach the openings in at least one side of one of the structures as a series of channels. Kubby does not teach the printhead formed using lithographically masked etching techniques. Kubby does not teach the printhead configured to receive a supply of the ejectable liquid at an ambient temperature, wherein each heater element is configured such that the energy required to be applied to heat the heater element to cause ejection of an ink drop is less than the energy required to heat a volume of an ejectable liquid equal to the volume of the ink drop, from an ambient temperature to the boiling point.

Thiel teaches a plurality of structures laminated together in [Col. 5, Lines 32-40]. Thiel teaches a plurality of ejectable liquid inlets in fluid connection with the nozzles in [Col. 4, Lines 48-55]. Thiel teaches a plurality of passages for the ejectable liquid, the passages extending from the ejectable liquid inlets on the printhead to openings configured for connection an ejectable liquid supply in [Col. 3, Lines 32-41]. Thiel teaches adjacent structures within the laminated structure are laminated together so

Art Unit: 2853

that the passages funnel the ejectable liquid to the ejectable liquid inlets of the printhead in [Col. 20, Lines 53-67] and [Col. 3, Lines 32-41]. Thiel teaches each of the structures, apart from the printhead, are generally planar with openings to the passages on opposing sides, wherein the openings [9 and 14] in the side of one of the structures [3] are elongate, and the openings [102] on the abutting side of the adjacent structure [4] are also elongate; such that, the long dimension of the elongate openings in one side is angled relative to the long dimension of the openings of the abutting side in [Col. 13, Lines 34-38], also shown in Fig. 3. Thiel teaches openings in at least one side of one of the structures [4] is a series of channels [102] in [Col. 11, Lines 42-64] shown in Fig. 3. Thiel teaches the printhead formed using lithographically masked etching techniques in [Col. 18, Lines 42-45]. Silverbrook teaches for most liquids the critical temperature for an ejection temperature is substantially above the boiling point in [Col. 14, Lines 14-18]. Silverbrook teaches in [Col. 4, Lines 59-65] comprising a thermally activated liquid ink printing head being characterized by the energy required to eject a drop of ink being less than the energy required to raise the temperature of the received supply of ink of a volume equal to the volume of said ink drop above the ambient ink temperature to below ejection temperature. Ejection temperature is referred to in Claims 1, 19, and 38 as the temperature above boiling point. Therefore, "below ejection temperature" would include the boiling point.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Thiel and Silverbrook with the printhead of Kubby for the purpose of providing a higher nozzle density per row, a

Art Unit: 2853

manufacturing process for the printhead with low production costs, and to dissipate the full amount of the active power in the printed ink itself.

Kubby discloses elements of the claimed invention referring to claims 7, 11, 18, 23, 27, 30, 37, 47, and 54.

Kubby teaches the heater element in the form of a suspended or cantilever beam [18] in [Col. 3, Lines 53-55]. Kubby teaches the heater element [20a and 20b] causing a gas bubble to be formed on both sides of the heater element [20a and 20b] in [Col. 4, Lines 59-63]. Kubby teaches a heater element [20a or 20b] that is substantially covered by a protective coating substantially to all sides, which are seamless in [Col. 4, Lines 32-50] shown in Fig. 4.

6. Claims 5, 25, and 42 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubby (US Pat. 5,706,041) in view of Thiel (US Pat. 5,714,078) and Silverbrook (US Pat. 5,856,836) as applied to claims 1, 19, and 38 above, and further in view of Dunn (US Pat. 4,982,199).

Kubby in view of Thiel and Silverbrook discloses the basic elements of the claimed invention except for the bubble forming liquid and the ejectable being a common body of liquid.

Dunn teaches the bubble forming liquid and the ejectable liquid common to each other in [Col. 2, Lines 31-38] (the bubble is created from the same ink as the ink that is ejected).

Art Unit: 2853

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Dunn with the printhead of Kubby in view of Thiel and Silverbrook for the purpose of heating the same ink with a heater to create a bubble to cause ejection of ink.

7. Claims 10, 29, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubby (US Pat. 5,706,041) in view of Thiel (US Pat. 5,714,078) and Silverbrook (US Pat. 5,856,836) as applied to claims 1, 19, and 38 above, and further in view of Feinn et al. (US Pat. 6,543,879).

Kubby in view of Thiel and Silverbrook discloses the basic elements of the claimed invention except for a nozzle density greater than 10000 nozzles/cm².

Feinn et al. teaches in [Col. 2, Lines 1-14] a nozzle packing density of at least 100 nozzles/mm², which is equal to 10000 nozzles/cm² when converted to square centimeters.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the nozzle density of Feinn et al. to the printhead of Kubby in view of Thiel and Silverbrook for the purpose of accommodating higher printing resolutions and to improve the printhead drop generation rate in [Col. 1, Lines 57-61].

8. Claims 6, 26, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubby (US Pat. 5,706,041) in view of Thiel (US Pat. 5,714,078) and Silverbrook

(US Pat. 5,856,836) as applied to claims 1, 19, and 38 above, and further in view of Watrobski et al. (US Pat. 5,742,307).

Kubby in view of Thiel and Silverbrook discloses the basic elements of the claimed invention except for the printhead being configured to print on a page and to be a page-width printhead.

Watrobski et al. teaches in [Col. 4, Lines 54-59] and [Col. 5, Lines 1-3] a page-width printer having a length equal to or greater than the width of a sheet of paper [14] and consisting of page-width printbars [12] made of an array of individual printhead subunits [18] shown in Fig. 11.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the page-width printing capability of Watrobski et al. to the printhead of Kubby in view of Thiel and Silverbrook for the purpose of continually moving a medium past a printhead as opposed to stepping the medium past a reciprocating printhead after a printed swath is completed.

9. Claims 8, 13, 24, 32, 44, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubby (US Pat. 5,706,041) in view of Thiel (US Pat. 5,714,078) and Silverbrook (US Pat. 5,856,836) as applied to claims 1, 19, and 38 above, and further in view of Silverbrook (US Pat. 5,841,452).

Kubby in view of Thiel and Silverbrook ('836) disclose the basic elements of the claimed invention except for the heater element configured such that an actuation energy of less than 500 nanojoules is required to heat the heater element sufficiently to

form a bubble to cause the ejection of a drop and except for a structure incorporating nozzles formed by chemical vapor deposition (CVD).

Silverbrook ('452) teaches that typically 200 nanojoules is required to eject a drop by heating the heater element in [Col. 18, Lines 15-18]. Silverbrook teaches a thick chemical vapor deposition (CVD) glass over coat [142] which forms the nozzle region in [Col. 9, Lines 57-58] shown in Fig. 12.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the requirement of applying a typical heating energy of 200 nanojoules and a nozzle plate formed by chemical vapor deposition (CVD) to the heating element and printhead of the Kubby in view of Thiel and Silverbrook ('836) printhead for the purpose of maintaining print speed while reducing power dissipation and to provide mechanical strength to resist the shock of exploding or collapsing vapor bubbles and to provide protection against the external environment in [Col. 8, Lines 22-25].

10. Claims 12, 31, and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubby (US Pat. 5,706,041) in view of Thiel (US Pat. 5,714,078) and Silverbrook (US Pat. 5,856,836) as applied to claims 1, 19, and 38 above, and further in view of Mitani et al. (US Pat. 5,831,648).

Kubby in view of Thiel and Silverbrook discloses the basic elements of the claimed invention except the bubble formed by the heating element is collapsed at a space away from the heating element.

Mitani et al. teaches a bubble collapsing at a position which is distant from the point where the bubble nucleates in [Col. 16, Lines 61-67] shown in Fig. 17D.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Mitani et al. with the printhead of Kubby in view of Thiel and Silverbrook for the purpose of causing the ink to flow towards the orifice.

11. Claims 14, 33, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubby (US Pat. 5,706,041) in view of Thiel (US Pat. 5,714,078) and Silverbrook (US Pat. 5,856,836) as applied to claims 1, 19, and 38 above, and further in view of Kashino et al. (US Pat. 5,534,898).

Kubby in view of Thiel and Silverbrook disclose the basic elements of the claimed invention except for a nozzle plate of the printhead having a thickness of less than 10 microns in [Col. 6, Lines 34-41].

Kashino et al. teaches a thickness of an orifice plate in the order of several microns in [Col. 6, Lines 34-41].

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the thickness of the Kashino et al. nozzle plate to the Kubby in view of Thiel and Silverbrook printhead for the purpose of obtaining adequate values of the velocity of the discharged ink droplets, amount of ink droplet and refilling frequency, and in consideration of the distance between the thermal energy generating element and the discharge port.

12. Claims 15, 34, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubby (US Pat. 5,706,041) in view of Thiel (US Pat. 5,714,078) and Silverbrook (US Pat. 5,856,836) as applied to claims 1, 19, and 38 above, and further in view of Komuro (US Pat. 4,965,594).

Kubby in view of Thiel and Silverbrook discloses the basic elements of the claimed invention except for a plurality of nozzle chambers each corresponding to a respective nozzle, and a plurality of said heater elements being disposed within each chamber, the heater elements within each chamber being formed on different respective layers to one another.

Komuro teaches heating resistors [11A, 21, and 31] of a first, second, and third layer formed on different respective layers and a plurality of nozzles [2] having chambers [4] with heaters [11A, 21, and 31] disposed within in [Cols. 3 and 4, Lines 25-68 and 1-34] shown in Figs. 1-4.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the stated structure of Komuro with the printhead of Kubby in view of Thiel and Silverbrook for the purpose of keeping discharge speed and frequency characteristics in a stable manner.

13. Claims 16, 35, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubby (US Pat. 5,706,041) in view of Thiel (US Pat. 5,714,078) and

Silverbrook (US Pat. 5,856,836) as applied to claims 1, 19, and 38 above, and further in view of Chan (US Pat. 5,710,070).

Kubby in view of Thiel and Silverbrook discloses the basic elements of the claimed invention except for a heater element formed of solid material of which more than 90% of which, by atomic proportion, is constituted by at least one periodic element having an atomic number below 50.

Chan teaches a thermal inkjet printhead comprising a resistive layer composed of titanium-nitride, which forms a resistor and a contact metal barrier layer in [Col. 2, Lines 10-14]. Titanium has an atomic number less than 50 on the periodic table.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the titanium-nitride resistor to the printhead of Kubby in view of Thiel and Silverbrook for the purpose of having resistors that are more reliable, especially at higher temperatures and less complicated to manufacture.

14. Claims 17, 36, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubby (US Pat. 5,706,041) in view of Thiel (US Pat. 5,714,078) and Silverbrook (US Pat. 5,856,836) as applied to claims 1, 19, and 38 above, and further in view of Pan et al. (US Pat. 4,931,813).

Kubby in view of Thiel and Silverbrook discloses the basic elements of the claimed invention except for the heater element configured to a mass of less than 10 nanograms.

Pan et al. discloses the heater element including a solid that is heated to form a bubble vapor to cause ejection of an ink drop, but does not explicitly teach the solid having a mass less than 10 nanograms. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply at least 10 nanograms of the solid material to the heating element of Kubby in view of Thiel and Silverbrook printhead to cause an ejection of an ink drop since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ (CCPA 1980).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art references (US Pat. 5,850,241) cited in PTO 892 form show elements that are deemed to be relevant to the present invention. These references should be reviewed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Han S. Choi whose telephone number is (571) 272-8350. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Meier can be reached on (571) 272-2149. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HSC
2/15/06



HAI PHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER